

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 1997

GUEST EDITOR'S MESSAGE



At last year's Board meeting of the National Association of Probation Executives I was asked to edit this edition of the *Executive Exchange* in order to highlight some of the probation programs in California. Unfortunately, because of California's unique state mandated and funded training requirements (Standards for Training in Corrections, or STC), few California probation personnel attend the national conferences of the American Probation and Parole Association or the American Correctional Association. Hopefully, with the agreement to bring APPA's 1999 Winter Training Institute to Los Angeles, this situation will change.

Many innovative and resourceful programs, some of potential national significance, are operating, but are not known outside of California because of the limited opportunity to exchange information at national conferences. I asked the California chiefs who are members of NAPE to submit articles that they thought would be of interest to the Association's membership.

In addition to a very exciting program that the Los Angeles County Probation Department has been spearheading since May 1996, and based on Orange County's pioneering research on indicators of future delinquency, there are articles from Humboldt County (a rural county in the midst of the redwoods of far northwest California) on new approaches to probation in a rural county; Fresno County (the raisin capital of the world in the heart of the Central Valley) on a police-school-probation partnership; Riverside County (of the southern desert and Palm Springs fame) on an increasingly popular vision therapy program; and Ventura County (northwest of Los Angeles) on supervision of domestic violence offenders.

I hope you find these articles interesting and informative.

Barry J. Nidorf
Chief Probation Officer Emeritus
Los Angeles County, California

CONTENTS

Guest Editor's Message, <i>Barry J. Nidorf</i>	1
President's Message, <i>Dave Savage</i>	2
The MAARY-C Program, <i>Paul Higa</i>	3
An Innovative Probation Approach for a Rural County, <i>Vikki Bernstein and Jennifer Roberts</i>	4
Fresno Probation, Police, and Schools Team up to Fight Campus Crime, <i>Sam Obwald</i>	5
Improving Academic Skills and Impacting Juvenile Crime through Vision Therapy, <i>Thomas J. Callanan</i>	6
Domestic Violence Supervision Program, <i>Cynthia Lompart</i>	7
News from the Field	9

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

Executive Exchange, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. In keeping with the ethical standards of NAPE, the contents of articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association and the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University unless so stated.

The contents of this issue are copyrighted. Articles may be reproduced without charge as long as permission is obtained from the editor and credit is given to both the author and *Executive Exchange*.

Submissions for publication consideration should be typed on 8½ by 11 inch paper, double-spaced, with at least one inch margins. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a black and white photograph for possible inclusion. Manuscripts exceeding one page in length should be submitted on a computer diskette, with the software used indicated.

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* should be directed to Dan Richard Beto at (409) 294-1675. Facsimiles may be sent to (409) 294-1671. All correspondence regarding *Executive Exchange* should be sent to the following:

Dan Richard Beto, Director
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

The Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University serves as the Secretariat for the National Association of Probation Executives. *Executive Exchange* is published by Sam Houston Press.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



I hope you enjoy the varied and interesting articles in this edition of *Executive Exchange*. Barry Nidorf, the guest editor for this issue, has gathered a variety of articles from contributing writers throughout California.

The articles share with the reader a number of interesting programs and initiatives, ranging from early intervention with youths at risk, to vision therapy to improve academic skills, innovation in probation in a rural setting, partnership between schools, police, and probation, and domestic violence supervision programming. Thanks much to the authors of these articles. Also, thanks to Barry Nidorf for his work as guest editor, most impressive in his retirement!

You are all invited to attend the NAPE reception on the evening of August 16, and the annual breakfast and board meeting on August 17, during the APPA 1997 Annual Institute in Boston, Massachusetts. During the breakfast the Sam Houston State University Award will be presented to the outstanding probation executive.

I hope to see you in Boston!

Dave Savage
President

THE MAARY-C PROGRAM: A COLLABORATION FROM STUDY TO PROGRAM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

by
Paul Higa
Chief, Juvenile Services Bureau
Los Angeles County Probation Department
Downey, California

In August 1993, the Los Angeles County Probation Department completed an initial study of its youthful offenders and found that:

16% of 11,500 first time referrals to probation in the first six months of 1990 accounted for 67% of the group's subsequent referrals during a three year follow-up.

This finding was consistent with those of other juvenile delinquency studies which also showed that a relatively small group of youthful offenders account for a high proportion of reported crimes.

Responding to the significance of this finding, the Department formed a committee of probation staff to oversee an extensive case data collection effort by the Office of Planning and Development to identify characteristics of this habitual youthful offender group. This committee, the Early Prevention Indicator Committee (EPIC), also focused on setting a framework for a new direction in delinquency prevention in Los Angeles County involving a multi-agency multi-disciplinary approach aimed at early identification and intervention of this group. As part of its planning efforts, the committee received technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections.

To develop a more complete profile of Los Angeles County's at-risk youth, in November 1993 the Department also formed a County Multi-Agency At-Risk Youth Committee (MAARY-C), consisting of eleven county and city agencies/departments. This committee formulated a plan for a multi-agency data sharing effort which resulted in additional case data to enhance the initial study. It also formulated strategies and actions to address the findings.

The following characteristics of habitual youthful offenders were determined by these multiple efforts:

- Young age-average 14.1 years old
- Gang affiliation or membership
- Low academic performance
- Unsatisfactory school attendance
- Poor school behavior
- Alcohol or drug use
- Incorrigible/runaway
- Parent's marital status

The Program Design Process

Armed with these findings and technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections, the EPIC and MAARY-C committees elected to share the information from the study with the community. The committees believed that community participation in deciding what course of action to take was essential. The committees also believed the community would respond and take appropriate action.

The City of Long Beach was selected. Long Beach presented three important features: (1) it had a history of inno-

vative programs; (2) it had a target population; and (3) it had a network of service providers.

The first critical step in the process was to identify service providers in Long Beach and invite them to community meetings. Thirty-five service providers and other community groups were identified. They attended four community meetings in August and September of 1995 and received research data and findings.

A milestone was reached at the fourth meeting in September 1995. Agencies agreed to form the Long Beach MAARY-C to work together to develop a prevention program aimed at early identification and intervention of the "16% type" youth before they entered the juvenile justice system.

From September 1995 through April 1996, the Long Beach MAARY-C met monthly, and often semi-monthly, to design a prevention program. Discussions focused on a program design that would be community-operated and driven, using community resources and expertise. It was agreed that ownership of the program should be with the community.

In late April 1996, the design was completed and the program was launched with over 22 service providers and agencies participating. No funds were available, but service providers and agencies agreed to provide in-kind services to the extent possible within existing budgets. This group consisted of departments from Los Angeles County and the City of Long Beach. It also included community-based organizations in the City of Long Beach. This group shared a common belief — "it is critical to collectively invest in prevention by working collaboratively and providing coordinated services to this group of troubled youth and their families."

The Program

This community-designed and community-based program operates in five ZIP Codes (90802, 90805, 90806, 90810 and 90813) in the City of Long Beach. These ZIP Codes provide a high concentration of the target group.

Youths, 11-14 years of age who reside in the target area and present characteristics of the "16%" profile, are eligible for the program. These youths must be free of delinquency court wardship and free of a history of referrals to probation. Family members of these youths are also eligible for services.

Participation is voluntary but strongly urged by the referring agency. Agency efforts are focused to impress the youths, their parents, and other caretakers with the urgency to participate in the program.

The program consists of five basic components. Each participating service provider or agency is assigned to one component and is charged with a specific responsibility. These components, assignments, and responsibilities are as follows:

Referring Agency: The school district's six middle schools and attendance office serving students from the designated ZIP Codes, the two law enforcement agencies serving the target and adjacent areas, and the Department of Children and Family Services are the designated referring agencies. They identify and refer eligible youth and their parents to an assigned assessment center.

Assessment Center: A county department (mental health), a city department (Health and Human Services), and a community-based organization (Long Beach Youth Centers) are

assigned as assessment centers. They receive referrals from referring agencies assigned to them. They validate eligibility of youth who are referred, execute study group assignments (Control or Experimental), and do case assessments.

Case Management: A county department (probation) is assigned to perform these duties, which include organizing multi-agency case assessments, linking service providers to identified case needs, monitoring services, and supporting youth and family efforts to receive services.

Service Provider: Fourteen agencies are designated as service providers, each assigned to deliver a specific service. Examples of services include mental health, counseling, parenting, vocational training, drug education, mentoring, tutoring, and recreation.

Research/Evaluation: A county department (probation) is responsible for determining random study group assignments, collecting and analyzing program data, and preparing program reports.

Approximately 200 youths and families will participate in the program during a two and a half year period. About 100 will be assigned to an experimental group and the other half to a control group. Participants in the experimental group will receive case management services, case assessments, and priority to services. Participants in the control group will receive case assessments and referrals to service providers.

Some key program goals are:

- To validate the referral document used to identify “16% type” youths
- To improve the youths’ school-related performance and activities
- To improve personal and family issues such as self-esteem, communication and parenting
- To reduce delinquency “indicators” such as gang involvement, substance abuse, and runaways
- To minimize the frequency of arrests and referrals to probation
- To determine the efficacy of the multi-agency multi-disciplinary model of service delivery

As a result of the preliminary research and strategic planning, coupled with widespread community support, this program recently received the approval of the California State Board of Corrections to participate in its Repeat Offender Prevention Project and to receive some funding.

Conclusion

An undertaking of this nature requires the leadership and support of the Chief Probation Officer. In Los Angeles County, Chief Probation Officer Barry J. Nidorf provided the vision, urged collaboration, and enabled staff and interested others to take action. This program is an example of the creativity that exists in a community and how it can participate in developing its own program.

Executive Exchange looks forward to publishing the outcome results of this project once sufficient data has been collected.

AN INNOVATIVE PROBATION APPROACH FOR A RURAL COUNTY

by
Vikki Bernstein and Jennifer Roberts
Senior Probation Officers
Humboldt County Probation Department
Eureka, California

Humboldt County is located in the Northwestern corner of California and is one of the state’s most rural and isolated counties.

According to available statistics, over one-third of the children born in 1993 were from low-income families. Over the past ten years, families from overcrowded inner cities of the United States and immigrants have migrated to rural areas in search of the “good life.” This immigration has brought new cultures rich in art, literature, music, exotic cuisine and new life styles. However, the increase in population has also brought poverty, family problems, and crime. People’s natural resistance to change, combined with fear of the unknown, has given rise to another set of challenges in Humboldt County.

In a community that rarely locked its doors and whose crime concerns were relatively minor, the immediate tendency was to look the other way and deny the need to change. During this initial denial phase, juvenile gang activity escalated as did substance abuse and property crimes.

Probation was faced with an overcrowded juvenile hall and county jail. Both those institutions were forced to release minors and inmates that previously would have been detained. Adult and juvenile caseloads grew at an alarming rate and the county lacked the financial means to allow for additional staff. The Humboldt County Probation Department was challenged to develop a means to adequately supervise wards and probationers and to ensure community safety.

Probation Chief David Lehman had the insight to be creative with job assignments, thus expanding the role of probation. Community correction modules were developed by combining adult and juvenile officers on teams according to geographic communities. Staff of the Humboldt County Probation Department worked closely with the Community Congress and the Juvenile Justice Commission in the development of community forums and town hall meetings. Law enforcement and treatment agencies participated as well. Community response was positive and resulted in the formation of citizen chaired committees to investigate and develop solutions to specific crimes and problems caused by crime. In essence, probation became the link between law enforcement and treatment and the bridge to the community. This opened channels of communication, and citizens who previously felt helpless and victimized became empowered. People began to feel they could “take back their community” through positive action using the tools these meetings provided.

Probation teams became more proactive in the community. The traditional 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. work day was no

longer the norm as many officers began working evenings and weekends.

The use of electronic monitoring as a means to supervise high risk individuals was employed to address jail and juvenile hall overcrowding. Law enforcement agencies contributed funds for the use of this technology in their respective jurisdictions. In addition, the cross-training between probation and law enforcement personnel ensured levels of supervision consistent with community needs.

Probation teams developed meetings at the schools with law enforcement personnel to address campus crime, including gang activity, burglaries, substance abuse, and truancy. Subsequent meetings with law enforcement personnel occurred to plan such proactive events as searches, “knock and talks” to suppress gang activity, and criminal tracking, as well as to coordinate their joint presence at community and school events. In addition, probation officers met with treatment providers to develop cohesive case plans for both adult probationers and juvenile wards. The team approach of adult and juvenile probation officers working together with treatment providers frequently was the catalyst for involving an entire family, which has proven successful.

Although initially more time consuming than traditional probation, the community corrections approach eventually saves time and helps stem crime. The actions of probationers and wards are essentially monitored around the clock, either by probation, law enforcement, treatment, or citizens. The final result is those convicted or adjudicated enter mainstream society or they are arrested and removed from the community.

Since the implementation of this community corrections initiative in Humboldt County, statistics show a decrease in property crimes. Community feedback is that gang activity has greatly decreased and communities are looking toward increasing methods to address substance abuse. Probation expansion and reformation has made officers more visible and accessible to their community. This concerted approach appears to benefit everyone.

Senior Probation Officers Vikki Bernstein and Jennifer Roberts are the team leaders of the community corrections modules for the Humboldt County Probation Department.

FRESNO PROBATION, POLICE, AND SCHOOLS TEAM UP TO FIGHT CAMPUS CRIME

by
Sam Obwald
Probation Services Manager
Fresno County Probation Department
Fresno, California

The aim of every school district is to provide all students with a safe environment in which to learn. With the drastic

increases in juvenile crime, this task has become much more difficult. Further, it is no longer just a problem for the inner city, but has spread to all communities.

While police officer presence on school campuses may reduce the incidents of violence, it does not address the overall problem. A more comprehensive multi-agency approach is needed.

If a minor is arrested on a school campus for theft, the police officer has only two options. He may arrest the youth or reprimand and release the offender. In both instances, there is little or no communication between the officer, the probation department, and the schools. Generally speaking, this type of action is ineffective.

In the fall of 1992, the Fresno Unified School District was faced with this exact situation. Although plainclothed detectives had been working on high school campuses for a number of years and had developed a good working relationship with school officials, the limitations on their ability to provide suitable sanctions continued to exist.

During the 1992-93 school year, a joint task force consisting of representatives from the Fresno County Probation Department, the Fresno Police Department, and the Fresno Unified School District met to discuss the needs of the district. The result was the creation of the campus-based Police/Probation Teams. Each team consisted of a police officer, probation officer, and a designated school administrator. Teams were placed in each of the seven high schools and provided services to juvenile offenders residing in or attending elementary, middle, and high school within each of the high school pyramids.

As part of the team approach, Fresno Unified School District provided office space and supplies, the assistance of school counselors, and school computers. Police/Probation Teams were also given access to student files as needed. School officials also increased the efficiency of the teams by monitoring conditions of probation as they related to school activity.

The immediate benefits of this initiative were obvious. The probation caseloads were assigned geographically so that each probation officer supervised minors who attended school where the officer was assigned. Regular contact simply involved having the minor brought from class to the Police/Probation Team office. Attendance could be monitored on a daily basis and violations of probation could be handled swiftly.

In addition, misdemeanor offenses committed on the school campuses could be dealt with quickly and informally if the circumstances were appropriate. In many cases, the police report could be written, parents notified, and an informal contract set up in the same working day. When the offense resulted in a school suspension, the Community Service Work Program could be ordered on the days the minor would not be attending school.

At the same time, school officials could meet with the parents to discuss the minor’s behavior and the corrective measures needed to improve the conduct.

Since the inception of the Police/Probation Team concept in the school year 1993-94, the most striking improvement has been in the reduction of school violence. Comparative statistics between the school years 1992-93 and 1995-96 show

a drastic decline in violent offenses on school campuses. Batteries on teachers were down 78%, assaults with weapons on teachers were down 100%, and assaults with weapons on students were down 33%. During the same period, the number of firearms confiscated on campuses dropped from a high of 49 to just seven. Possession of other types of weapons decreased by 18%.

Charges	1992/	1993/	1994/	1995/	1996/	1995/	Total
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1996	Reduction	
Loitering	986	617	439	209		-79%	
Battery-Teacher	55	28	23	12		-78%	
ADW-Teacher	2	3	1	0		-100%	
ADW-Student	12	12	7	8		-33%	
Possession of Firearms	49	28	12	7		-86%	
Other Weapons	151	180	129	124		-18%	

Because of its success, the program was expanded in September of 1995 to include the placing of probation officers on selected middle school sites. Under a grant obtained by the Fresno Police Department, one of the middle school probation officers was teamed with a police officer.

In September of 1996, through joint funding between the Fresno County Probation Department and the Fresno Unified School District, two additional probation officers were assigned to the middle schools. These officers not only deal with criminal offenses committed by minors attending the designated middle schools, but will address the issue of school truancy.

In addition to the eleven probation officers assigned to the Fresno Unified campuses, an agreement has been reached to place a Police/Probation Team on the newly constructed Central Unified High School Campus.

Campus-based Police/Probation Teams may not be the answer for all school districts, but they have demonstrated the positive outcomes that can be reached when three separate governmental agencies work in a spirit of cooperation to reach a common goal.

IMPROVING ACADEMIC SKILLS AND IMPACTING JUVENILE CRIME THROUGH VISION THERAPY

by
Thomas J. Callanan
Chief Probation Officer
Riverside County Probation Department
Riverside, California

Probation agencies throughout our nation are constantly being challenged at a time of limited resources to come up with new, innovative techniques that will address many of the causes of crime and delinquency. Demands for accountability and value of the dollar require new methods in managing our meager resources. Citizens in state after state con-

tinue to vote for new laws that seek simple solutions to complex problems. In reviewing the literature from throughout the country and talking with probation administrators, I am proud to note that many of our colleagues are meeting the challenges being foisted upon them by a modern day society.

Permit me to share with you a program that has been developed in the Riverside County Probation Department. I believe this program, which addresses one of the major causes of delinquency and truancy due to poor grades, will, if adopted by other departments, impact on juvenile crime.

The Program

The Structure Of Intellect/Vision Program is a program designed to identify and treat minors with visual, auditory, and perceptual learning disability problems. This program is in operation at both of the Riverside County Probation Department's treatment facilities — the Twin Pines Ranch and the Van Horn Youth Center. Upon admittance to the treatment programs, every minor receives a comprehensive vision and education examination. Subsequently, an individualized treatment plan designed to improve learning disabilities, vision, and other information processing problems is implemented. Studies have shown that a high percentage of delinquents suffer from learning disabilities, and their educational and social adjustment can be improved by treatment in this area. Corrective glasses are provided to minors who are in need of them. It was initially projected that 70% of the Twin Pines population would require treatment in the SOI/Vision Program; however, the actual percentage of minors requiring treatment has been determined to be over 90%.

The SOI/Vision Program is a collaborative effort between the probation department and a private provider, The SOI Learning Center of Riverside. The program founder, Blanch Brandt, Ph.D., works closely with probation staff assigned to this project to implement this unique program. The program was originally developed in the early 1980s for San Bernardino County, however, it was discontinued in 1992. Dr. Brandt's experience gained during those formative years has been invaluable in her implementation of a new and more intensive program for the Riverside County Probation Department, which commenced in 1994.

Dr. Brandt notes that over the past 15 years more than 7,000 minors in the juvenile justice system have been tested, and over 95% of them failed the vision screening battery. Approximately 70% of those tested were performing three or more grade levels below their expected norm. Approximately 40% of them had not developed the auditory processing, visual patterning skills, and sequential memory needed to succeed in the academic setting. Most of those tested are school dropouts with long histories of school related problems and no record of testing or treatment for these visual deficiencies. The SOI/Vision Program is designed to address these problems. The program concept is one of addressing the root cause of contributing factors involved in school failure and low self-esteem which in turn relates to acting out behavior and delinquency.

The methods used in the program are to provide comprehensive visual health histories, vision screening, develop-

mental visual examinations, and prescribed corrective lenses and/or optometric vision therapy. The developmental examination checks visual function and visual processing abilities as well as eye health and the need for glasses. Past research has shown that although most incarcerated youth have normal 20/20 unaided visual acuity, over 90% have problems in the areas of eye movement ability, focusing ability, eye teaming ability, and perception. These problems lead to physical symptoms that interfere with the reading and learning process, such as losing one's place when reading, appearance of the print moving on the page, eyestrain, headaches, and more. They also lead to processing difficulties that include poor comprehension, poor concentration, and distractibility.

Vision therapy includes physical exercises to strengthen the muscles of the eyes and to remediate visual deficits. Once a program of vision therapy has been completed, the minor receives a vision progress evaluation to determine if any need for enhancement of the vision system remains.

If a minor is three or more grades below his expected norm, he is immediately scheduled for the Structure Of Intellect Learning Abilities Educational Analysis Profile. This is a three-hour session of cognitive testing which also confirms visual deficits through the cognitive processing abilities as well as the level of development. After reviewing all of the testing procedures, an individualized treatment plan is recommended and implemented. The primary goals of the SOI are to provide training in the many intellectual abilities students need in order to learn academic subject matter and to enable them to improve their ability to make intelligent decisions regarding their lives upon release from custody. The SOI evaluation scores are extremely important because, perhaps for the first time, the youth are being taught critical thinking skills — ability to reach conclusions, to make decisions, and to make judgements concerning issues in life.

Once the SOI treatment has been completed, a post-test is performed using the Structure Of Intellect Career Analysis Profile for comparisons of pre and post test scores. In addition, this instrument is used to assist the minor with formulating a viable approach to his future educational and vocational goals.

Staff/Costs

The annual cost of the SOI/Vision Program is \$23,734, which is provided through the probation department's budget. This is the cost to retain the private provider to conduct the program at both the Twin Pines Ranch and the Van Horn Youth Center. An additional \$5,000 was provided within the Bureau of Justice Assistance boot camp grant for equipment and supplies for the program. In addition, at the Twin Pines Ranch there are three counseling staff members who have been trained by Dr. Brandt to conduct the treatment. The primary function of these three counselors is to conduct the SOI/Vision Program. The group consists of an Auditory Therapist and On-Site Coordinator, an SOI Therapist and a Vision Therapist. At the Van Horn Youth Center there are two counseling staff members assigned to the SOI/Vision Program.

Evaluation

An indicator of the value of the SOI/Vision Program is the significant gains in academic testing scores for the Twin Pines Ranch cadets after completion of the program. All of the cadets that participated in the SOI/Vision Program during the 1995-96 school year (from July of 1995 to July of 1996) were tested both before participating in the program and after completion of the program. The testing was conducted by staff of Riverside County Schools which operates Twin Pines High School, the on-site school. The instrument utilized was the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). The results of the testing reflect the average grade level comparisons of all participants. Similar improvements in test scores were obtained by the Van Horn Youth Center participants. The results are as follows:

TABLE — Twin Pines Ranch 1995-96 School Year Average Grade Level Comparisons			
	Pre-Test Before SOI/Vision Treatment	Post-Test After SOI/Vision Treatment	
Reading	6.7 grade level	9.1 grade level	
Mathematics	6.6 grade level	8.7 grade level	
Language	5.0 grade level	7.3 grade level	

Summary

The benefits to the minors treated in the SOI/Vision Program are great. They include the greatly improved academic skills documented above, increased self-esteem, and increased ability to use critical thinking skills. The skills gained in the program help to lay a foundation upon which the cadets can build their future. The staff of both the Twin Pines Ranch and the Van Horn Youth Center feel that this project has addressed one of the root causes of delinquent behavior and that it has great potential to be a large factor in reducing the rate of recidivism for program graduates.

For further information on this program, contact Blanch Brandt, Ph.D., SOI Learning Center, 5051 Canyon Crest, Suite 102, Riverside, California 92509, Telephone (909) 686-3937.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SUPERVISION PROGRAM

by
Cynthia Lompart
Senior Deputy Probation Officer
Ventura County Corrections Service Agency
Oxnard, California

In 1994, after the tragic deaths of two women, the Ventura County Corrections Services Agency (probation department) identified domestic violence as a high priority public safety issue. Previously hit with annual budget cuts that led to diminished probation services, particularly to misdemeanor

units where the majority of domestic violence cases were handled, the agency committed to form a pilot program to enhance the monitoring of domestic violence offenders and to improve victim services. With funding received from Proposition 172 (Californians voted a ½ cent sales tax allocated for use by law enforcement), and with an agency reorganization plan, the ground work was set to develop a new domestic violence sub-unit.

During this same time period, effective July 1, 1994, California legislators passed Assembly Bill 226 which mandated that county probation departments design and implement an approval/renewal/monitoring process of court ordered batterers' treatment programs. To establish standards and guidelines for these programs, the Corrections Services Agency formed a task force comprised of probation officials, District Attorney staff, and local treatment program providers. The treatment approach was patterned after the Duluth curriculum model which stressed the premise that domestic violence is criminal behavior that is learned and can therefore be unlearned. The safety and rights of the abused victim were given the highest priority, with the goal of the batterers' programs being to end the batterers' abusive behavior, and not necessarily the preservation of the relationship. The treatment sessions utilize a structured educational approach in a small (no more than 15 participants) group setting. The treatment facilitators use a combination of discussion and written exercises, while holding the batterer accountable for his abusive behavior. The batterer is required to complete 52 sessions within 58 weeks, with each session lasting a minimum of two hours. Currently, there are four approved domestic violence treatment providers within Ventura County.

The "west county" area of Ventura County had the highest number of domestic violence offenders and, consequently, was chosen as the site for the pilot program. In 1994, the "west county" area had approximately 600 domestic violence cases spread among 15 probation caseloads with ratios of 350 to 500 misdemeanor offenders to one probation officer. Caseload standards for the domestic violence sub-unit were set at 140 cases per probation officer, with four deputy probation officers, one senior deputy probation officer and one (half position) supervising deputy probation officer who also manages a larger misdemeanor unit.

In December 1994, through a small grant with funding provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) sent two consultants to provide training and technical assistance to the Corrections Services Agency. The consultants, Andy Klein, the Chief Probation Officer in Quincy, Massachusetts, and Ann Crowe, APPA Family Violence Program Manager, conducted a two day on-site visit and compiled a Technical Assistance Report that specifically addressed the obstacles and strengths that were facing the Corrections Services Agency in the organization of the new domestic violence sub-unit. The report detailed invaluable information and recommendations that were utilized in the implementation of the domestic violence sub-unit.

In February of 1995 the domestic violence sub-unit was fully staffed and operational. Intensive supervision guide-

lines have been established for monitoring the domestic violence offender and include frequent home visits, close communication with the treatment providers, and on-going communication with the victim. As part of the program, the victim is provided with an informational handout explaining domestic violence safety plans, restraining orders, types of abuse, and phone numbers for crisis counselors and other advocacy services. A zero tolerance philosophy toward domestic violence is strictly enforced and violations of probation are swiftly returned to court.

In addition to restructuring Ventura County's approach to probation supervision of the domestic violence offenders, the Corrections Services Agency joined with the Oxnard Police Department, the Ventura County District Attorney's Office, and a local non-profit organization, Interface Children and Family Services (ICFS), to provide a collaborative effort to combat domestic violence within the City of Oxnard utilizing a community-based response team approach. With funding received from the United States Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Oxnard Police Department received a grant to establish the Domestic Violence Elimination Response Team (DVERT). The team includes the partnering of two non-sworn community safety officers with trained volunteer calls for service. The teams, assigned to different areas of the city, shadow the responding police officers and, once the location has been deemed safe, contact the victim to provide immediate support and resource information. Team members also assist with Emergency Protection Orders, if desired by the victim, and assist the responding officer with completion of the domestic violence investigation. The team provides "follow up" contact with the victim and offers support for the victim during the prosecution phase.

The assistant district attorney assigned to the DVERT program devotes one half of his or her time to the program. This allows for vertical prosecution of DVERT cases from complaint review through sentencing. In addition, it provides for consistency in handling probation violation hearings. There is also one probation officer position devoted to this grant. That officer provides comprehensive monitoring of the domestic violence offender, as well as close communication with the victim. As part of the grant, ICFS provides clinical services to victims and their children. It is anticipated that the linking of these agencies (police, prosecutor, probation, and ICFS-community volunteers) will enhance services to the domestic violence victim, and hold the batterer strictly accountable for his abusive behavior.

To measure this grant's success, members from the Criminal Justice Department of California Lutheran University will be capturing data and conducting an overall evaluation. The quality and level of victim services received from the DVERT team will be compared to the services victims normally receive from the criminal justice system. Filing rates, prosecution time, number of successful prosecutions, probation monitoring of the offender, and offender recidivism will also be measured.

The formation of a domestic violence sub-unit and the ongoing collaborative efforts of addressing the community issue of domestic violence in Ventura County have proved to

be a learning experience for the Corrections Services Agency. Keeping up with domestic violence issues and attempting to gain the attention of the judicial system has not always been an easy task. However, every step taken toward eliminating domestic violence and providing a safer community remains a commitment of the Corrections Services Agency.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NORTH DAKOTA DISASTER FUND CREATED

A Disaster Fund has been established in accordance with law and the approval of the North Dakota Attorney General to assist probation and parole officers and support staff in Grand Forks, North Dakota, who lost their homes and most of their property as a result of the recent flooding.

Persons wishing to make a contribution to assist our colleagues in North Dakota may do so by sending a check to the following address:

North Dakota Disaster Fund
Division of Parole and Probation
P.O. Box 5521
Bismarck, North Dakota 58506-5521

POSITION AVAILABLE IN PIMA COUNTY, ARIZONA

The Pima County Juvenile Court in Tucson, Arizona, is advertising for a Division Manager for Calendar and Court Services with an annual salary range of \$49,992 to \$68,640.

The person selected for this position will be responsible for directing the Calendar and Court Services Division. More specifically, the Division Manager performs the following duties: supervises, recruits, and selects all unit personnel assigned to the Administrative/Program Services Unit; plans and directs through subordinate personnel the court calendaring/caseload management system for the Juvenile Court; oversees preparation and management of the court's budget; oversees the drafting and implementation of third-party contracts; assists the Court Director and Presiding Judge in short and long term planning for Juvenile Court operations; provides other assistance as directed; and supervises the Court Appointed Special Advocates, adoptions, calendaring, volunteers, and other functions as assigned by the Director and/or Presiding Judge.

Minimum requirement for this position include: a master's degree or advanced degree from an accredited college or university with a preference in public administration, criminal justice, or judicial administration of business; familiarity with social services or juvenile justice desirable; and five years of progressively responsible administrative experience (relevant experience may be substituted for a portion of the aforementioned education). A fellow of the Institute of Court Management from the National Center of State Courts is preferred.

A more detailed job description may be obtained from the Office of Human Resources of the Pima County Juvenile

Court. Persons interested should submit a resume by 4:00 p.m. on June 13, 1997, to:

Human Resource Office
Pima County Juvenile Court
2225 East Ajo Way
Tucson, Arizona 85713-6295

The selected applicant for this position will be required to undergo a complete background check and drug screening. It is the policy of the Pima County Juvenile Court not to discriminate in employment or in the provision of services. The Pima County Juvenile Court is an equal opportunity employer.

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR NEW COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS EXECUTIVES SCHEDULED

After considerable planning, the Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation executives has become a reality. This program is the result of a collaborative relationship between the National Association of Probation Executives, National Institute of Corrections, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. The first 36 hour seminar will be held at Sam Houston State University's George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center in Huntsville, Texas, on September 15-19, 1997.

This seminar will prepare participants to address issues and problems common to new community corrections chief executive officers. The curriculum addressing these special needs and issues will be presented in a peer interaction process. Key topics to be covered during the seminar include budget preparation and presentation, personnel issues, media relations, communications, special interest groups, operational framework, and strategic planning.

Persons involved in the delivery of this first program include **George M. Keiser** and **Rick Faulkner** with the National Institute of Corrections and National Association of Probation Executive members **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Dan Richard Beto, Ron Goethals, Richard E. Wyatt, Sue Gionfriddo, Don R. Stiles, and Richard A. Kipp.**

For the purpose of this seminar, a chief executive officer is an individual who has budget authority, responsibility for agency human resource management, policy development, and establishing the mission of the agency. Newly appointed community corrections chief executive officers are encouraged to apply for admission to this exciting training experience. Eligible persons interested in attending this seminar should contact Rick Faulkner at the National Institute of Corrections at (202) 307-3106, ext. 138.

NAPE TO MEET IN BOSTON

The next meeting of the National Association of Probation Executives will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, in conjunction with the 22nd Annual APPA Training Institute.

On the evening of Saturday, August 16, 1997, the Association will host a reception at the Sheraton Boston Hotel and

towers and on Sunday, August 17, 1997, the Annual Award Breakfast will be held at the Colonnade Hotel.

NAPE members are encouraged to make their reservations at the Colonnade Hotel, which is located at 120 Huntington Avenue in Boston across the street from the Sheraton and the Hynes Convention Center. The Colonnade, a member of the Summit International Hotels and the Concorde Group, may be contacted by calling (617) 424-7000 or the toll free number (800) 962-3030. When making reservations, identify yourself as attending the American Probation and Parole Association Annual Institute; a block of rooms has been reserved.

Members interested in learning more about Boston prior to the conference are encouraged to access the Boston Home Page on the Internet at <http://www.boston.com>. This site provides a wealth of information about the host city.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the last issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, three new members have joined the National Association of Probation Executives. They are as follows:

William J. Grosshans, Administrator, Division of Community Corrections, Wisconsin Department of Corrections, 149 East Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53707.

Kent Usher, Chief Probation Officer, Piatt County Probation and Court Services, Courthouse, Room 301, Monticello, Illinois 61856.

Deborah Quinlan, Program Manager, Genesee County Adult Probation Department, 919 Beach Street, Flint, Michigan 49502.

TRUTH IN SENTENCING RESOLUTION
ADOPTED BY APAI

At its annual meeting on April 27-30, 1997, the Association of Paroling Authorities, International (APAI), passed a resolution concerning "truth-in-sentencing." **Gail D. Hughes**, Executive Secretary of APAI and a NAPE member, has provided *Executive Exchange* with a copy of the resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas, greater credibility with the public and more predictability of sentences imposed and other community sanctions are goals of both the "truth-in-sentencing" advocates and parole boards; and

Whereas, "truth-in-sentencing" should be perceived as the method by which a criminal sentence is defined rather than as a form of sentencing; and

Whereas, in order for the public to know the "truth" about sentence, it should provide for a period of expected community sanctions and/or incarceration plus a period of time that can be adjusted accordingly to the offender's performance in prison, thus providing for incentives and consequences which reflect adjustments for risk to the public safety. There also can be a period of time during which the offender is supervised in the community in order that the offender can more likely be reintegrated or returned to prison if there is a danger to public safety; and

Whereas, the parole board of other similar releasing authority is the visible, accountable and independent decision-making body that is necessary to ensure implementation of the sentence in a way which maximizes public safety; and

Whereas, all such sentences are a limitation of freedom or other form of correctional control and thus must be defined as encompassing simple incarceration as well as split incarceration, community correction, post-release supervision and /or any other sanction that may be imposed; and

Whereas, in order to be truthful regarding any sentence, the terms of the sentence must be understandable, the public must be able to comprehend the sentence as it relates to the original crime, and any activity which goes with the sentence, such as incentives or consequences that shorten or lengthen the incarceration time, must be clearly stated and open for public accountability; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, that the concept of "truth-in-sentencing" is supported by the Association of Paroling Authorities, International, provided it is properly defined as outlined in this resolution.

The Association of Paroling Authorities, International, may be contacted at P.O. Box 211, California, Missouri 65018; the organization's telephone number is (573) 796-2113 and its fax number is (573) 796-2114.

PROBATION OFFICER KILLED BY
CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER

On Monday morning, April 28, 1997, **Gary Wright**, a former corrections officer at the Northeast Juvenile Treatment Facility in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and a convicted child molester, met with his probation officer, **Donald "Charley" R. Knepple**, and counselor **Steve Tielker** at the Family and Children's Services Center in Fort Wayne. After meeting with them for about 30 minutes, Wright shot both Knepple and Tielker in the head with a 9mm semiautomatic handgun. After fleeing to the back of the building, Wright turned the weapon on himself.

Family members and those in the community who knew Knepple and Tielker described them as compassionate, dedicated, and self-sacrificing. "Charley would have laid down his life for anyone," said the Rev. **Sandy Knepple**, the victim's sister-in-law. **Sandy Knepple**, a pastor in Monroeville, said it was some consolation to the family that Charley Knepple died while trying to make a difference in the world.

Knepple's friends at the Allen County Courthouse also spoke of his caring nature. **Jeff Leffers**, Director of Court Operations and the former Assistant Chief Probation Officer, said he was thrilled when Knepple joined his staff because of his intelligence and his compassion for others. **John F. Surbeck, Jr.**, Allen County Superior Court Judge, worked with Knepple as both an attorney and as a judge; he was impressed with his conscientiousness. "Charley was a good guy who cared about his probationers on one hand and the rules on the other hand," Surbeck said. "He required his probationers to follow the rules, but he was pretty sensitive as well."

The violent nature of Knepple and Tielker's deaths sharply contrasted the way they lived their lives.

Knepple is survived by his wife, Linda, son Scott, age 16, and daughter Amy, age 13. Tielker is survived by his wife Donna and a 13 year old daughter.

Information for the above came from the Fort Wayne *Journal Gazette* and from wire services.



American Probation and
Parole Association
22nd Annual Training Institute

"Catch the Spirit"
Join the Revolution Against Violence

Boston, Massachusetts
August 17 - 20, 1997

- ◆ A variety of workshops presented by nationally known speakers furnish current information for all experience levels.
- ◆ Thought-provoking and inspiring opening session features former New York City Police Commissioner William Bratton.
- ◆ Intensive sessions focus on today's hot topics.
- ◆ Exhibit showcase presents the industry's essential products and services.
- ◆ Special networking and social events make interacting with your peers easy and fun.

All Institute activities will be held at the
Sheraton Boston Hotel & Towers

For more information, please contact:

APPA Institute
c/o The Council of State Governments
P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578-1910
(606) 244-8204
Visit our web site at
<http://www.csg.org/appa/lappa.html>

Co-sponsored by the
New England Council on Crime
and Delinquency and the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Executive Office of Public Safety

Hosted by the
Massachusetts Office of the
Commissioner of Probation

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

Founded in 1981, the National Association of Probation Executives is a professional organization representing the chief executive officers of local, county and state probation agencies. NAPE is dedicated to enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness in the field of probation by creating a national network for probation executives, bringing about positive change in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training and research.

What We Do

- Assist in and conduct training sessions, conferences, and workshops on timely subjects unique to the needs of probation executives.
- Provide technical assistance to national, state, and local governments, as well as private institutions, that are committed to improving probation practices.
- Analyze relevant research relating to probation programs nationwide and publish position papers on our findings.
- Assist in the development of standards, training, and accreditation procedures for probation agencies.
- Educate the general public on problems in the field of probation and their potential solutions.

Types of Membership

Regular: Regular members must be employed full-time in an executive capacity by a probation agency or association. They must have at least two levels of professional staff under their supervision or be defined as executives by the director or chief probation officer of the agency.

Organizational: Organizational memberships are for probation and community corrections agencies. Any member organization may designate up to five administrative employees to receive the benefits of membership.

Corporate: Corporate memberships are for corporations doing business with probation and community corrections agencies or for individual sponsors.

Honorary: Honorary memberships are conferred by a two-thirds vote of the NAPE Board of Directors in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the field of probation or for special or long-term meritorious service to NAPE.

Subscriber: Subscribers are individuals whose work is related to the practice of probation.

Why Join

The National Association of Probation Executives offers you the chance to help build a national voice and power base for the field of probation and serves as your link with other probation leaders. Join with us and make your voice heard.

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ DATE OF APPLICATION _____

CHECK	Regular	☐ \$ 50 / 1 year	☐ \$ 95 / 2 years	☐ \$140 / 3 years
	Organizational	☐ \$250 / 1 year		
	Corporate	☐ \$500 / 1 year		

Please make check payable to **THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES** and mail to:

NAPE Secretariat
ATTN: Christie Haney
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
(409) 294-3757